

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXVI

PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH, 1932

No. 3

Respect for Public Officials

RESPECT for law and respect for public officials is the same element of character operating in closely related fields. He who despises one will despise the other. He who respects one will respect the other.

New Testament writers universally support that dictum of the Mosaic Law "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." They couple the two in condemnation, rebuking both the despisers of government and the revilers of dignitaries. Jesus Himself treated Pilate respectfully and enjoined, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

One of our besetting national sins has ever been reckless condemnation of public officials. From Washington to Hoover, indignities, mostly unmerited, have been heaped upon our Presidents. The greater and nobler the man; the greater the difficulties he has had to encounter, the more numerous have been the curses the sons of Shimei have hurled at him.

Congressional immunity, guaranteed free speech, party alignment, splendid features of our political life, have in their abuse involved us in this national sin.

To the credit of the Christian element of the nation be it said that few of those whose ideals are shaped by the Bible have been conspicuous offenders in this matter. It is one of the defects of character whose origin can be traced back to despotism, secularism and Romanism. Among these classes it grows out of a lack of proper respect for the civil government and is considered a legitimate weapon of party conflict.

The rehabilitation and further development of our Christian ideals is a task

**"Thou shalt not speak evil
of the ruler of thy people."**

EX. 22:28

which the post-war moral conditions force upon the Protestant churches. They can hope for little assistance in this work from either secularists, athe-

ists, or Romanists. These may devote themselves to economic, and political developments but the fundamental spiritual developments must be the contribution of a teaching church and prophetic ministry. Their answer to McFadden's calumny should be a thunderous cry from the pulpit, "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people."

Recently a book was published by a man with a very Roman sounding name as a part of the "Smear Hoover" campaign. Fortunately for the good name of the United States this book got into court on a charge of plagiarism. The Judge enjoined its sale and refused to consider the merits of the case. His comment was, "I have no sympathy with the purpose of a publication which is designed for no other purpose than to discredit the work of a public official." The public should applaud both this expression and action.

The presumption, self-will, egoism, partisan rancor and disloyalty that lie back of this national habit must be rebuked if we wish to maintain a government of laws administered by elected officials.

This reckless transgression of the canons of decency and right; this violation of the law of liberty is intimidating public officials from the highest to the lowest to an extent little realized. Such conduct should be, in flagrant cases, dealt with by law, but, in every case, by every organ of public expression with repudiation and reprobation.

No nation can continue moral progress which habitually subjects honest, efficient officials to public insult.

IN SOCIAL ROOM
OF
MONTGOMERY HALL

The Geneva Conference

IN spite of the war in the Far East the Geneva Conference on Disarmament was convened on time February 2 and is progressing as favorably as any one acquainted with world conditions could expect. So far from considering that the meeting is inopportune because of the background of war the delegates seem to feel that this regrettable circumstance is a present and forceful illustration of what every nation must confront unless the world disarms.

The Head of the Roman Catholic Church, commenting on this Conference, called attention to one element of the bad start it took in these words: "Statesmen and political men, bankers, financiers and men of peace when they meet in conference never raise their eyes to Heaven, never lift their thoughts to God, never remember that the things of this world do not obey the hand of man only."

The other disquieting event was Japan's blunt threat to withdraw from the Conference if there was any discussion of the Sino-Japanese affair. So far this has been the only hostile note heard in the Conference.

Petitions from the many peace organizations of every nation participating in the Conference were first received. Had all of the Unofficial Delegates who presented themselves with these petitions been heard in their presentation it would have required a week. Two and one-half hours were allowed to this oratory. Selection by Mary Wooley, the woman delegate from the United States, determined who should be heard. The impact of this total was impressive and to the delegates it was a mighty voice from the whole world demanding results.

The proposals of the major powers of the world were then received. This part of the program continued until February 11. Sir John Simon led the way in speaking for the British Commonwealth of Nations. He proposed the exclusion of submarines, poison gas, bacteria as well as the severe limitation upon all possible offensive arms. But in advance he objected to the proposal later made by France for an international armed force to be under the League of Nations for the purpose of protecting the disarmed nations.

Andre Tardieu, speaking for France, proposed extensive but not complete disarmament. He, however, stressed the necessity for security before this could take place and proposed an international police force under the League of Nations to guarantee that

security. In this he was seconded by Poland and the other nations of the Little Entente. The fear of possible consequences in any future revision of the treaty of Versailles was evident in this part of the discussion.

The position of Germany was then presented by Chancellor Breuning. That position is equality in armament for all whether that equality be high or low. Germany favors severe limitations and is willing that the other nations reduce to the present enforced standards.

Ambassador Hugh Gibson presented the views of the United States government. He assured the other nations that the United States would go as far as the other leading nations would venture in this process. He proposed extensive reductions in all possible offensive weapons both on a numerical and budgetary basis.

Maxim Litvinof, speaking for Soviet Russia, renewed the proposal for complete disarmament which he made four years ago, but this time coupled it with the more reasonable proposal that Russia would disarm to the extent and at the same rate that the other leading powers did. This latter was qualified by especial mention of "those upon our borders." This would include China, Japan, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Their proposal was considered to be analogous to that of the United States, perhaps a little more complete and extensive.

Baron Tsuneo Matsudaira spoke for Japan in the briefest address of the Conference. He assured the Conference that notwithstanding the unfortunate situation in the Far East, Japan is as eager as ever to further the cause of disarmament. The government and people of Japan favor the adoption of a draft convention as a foundation upon which the work of the Conference can be built. This will probably be taken up during the recess in March. Japan favors the limitation in the number and size of ships and the caliber of guns and reduction in the tonnage of air craft carriers, the prohibition of the use of poison gas, bacteria and air bombardment but favors only stricter laws as to the use of submarines.

Italy's proposals were presented by Dino Grandi. He advocated the barring of force as a means of establishing security. He referred to the French proposal of an international police force as "one of the sophistries of disarmament." He further advocated the extension of the life of the Washington and London treaties, the acceptance of the German demand

for equality for all in armaments. As a practical working basis he accepted the proposals of the United States and Great Britain to limit severely all types of offensive arms.

The proposals of the smaller nations of the world are now being received. After they are in, a recess will be taken during which a general plan will be worked out by private conversations between the various nations and in committees.

One outstanding fact is evident so far in these proposals. That is that every nation seems most anxious to limit that type of armament to which she is most vulnerable and to cling to that type that she can use most effectively. The greatest obstacle that has arisen is the difference between France and her allies and the rest of the world as to the necessity of establishing security before any further disarmament takes place. Most of the nations seem willing to establish security by taking the step of faith and laying aside offensive arms.

While it is encouraging to know that the representatives of many peace organizations are attending the Conference sessions and have had the opportunity of presenting the claims of peace before the Conference, we must not forget there is another group there whose pictures will never be in the newspapers, a group that will keep under cover, which will be ceaselessly active in opposing every proposed reduction of armaments.

This group, not numerous but ubiquitous and powerful, made itself felt even before the Conference convened. It is the unofficial, unclassified group representing the munition makers from America, England, Germany, France, and other industrial countries. While others are seeking a method by which recurring problems in international life can be solved in a peaceable way, these sellers of war material, manufacturers of gunpowder, makers of guns and instruments of war, are busily spreading the information that this problem is too difficult to be solved in our generation. They are laying a smoke screen behind which they hope to be able to inspire more distrust than already exists, so that they can carry on their traffic in human blood.

To meet their opposition it will be necessary for those who love peace and believe in a reduction of national armaments to express their sentiments to the heads of their governments and to their representatives at Geneva.

The Ignus Fatus of State Sovereignty

IT may seem presumptuous to attempt to add to the results of a century old debate that has agitated the nation most of the time since 1777. But it is with us again in a new and intensified form and as troublesome as ever.

The question stripped of all its extraneous elements is, "Are the separate states of the union sovereignties with sovereign powers? To state it differently "Did the Declaration of Independence break up a certain section of the British Empire into thirteen separate sovereignties or did it transfer the sovereignty of that fragment to a national sovereignty called the United States of America?" Four times the nation has answered that question. Once in favor of state sovereignty and three times in favor of the national sovereignty.

We shall never settle this question finally until we cease using the term sovereign with two distinct contents of meaning. That we do so transgress in our use of language may be made clear by the following analogy. We call the crude oil pumped from the subterranean coal beds and oil sands, petroleum. In some countries gasoline is called petrol, which is merely an abbreviation. But gasoline is not petroleum by any means. Before petroleum becomes gasoline the analines, tar, asphalt or paraffine, benzine and kerosene as well as several other elements must be deleted. To give this residue of the original product the same name is an incorrect use of language. So it is with sovereignty. To call that limited self government possessed by the several states, "sovereignty" from which has been deleted the right to determine finally its own form of government, the treaty making power, the right to declare war, coin money, control commerce with the other states and foreign nations, to lay tariffs, to control its navigable rivers and the final support of its own laws, is the sort of use of words that calls gasoline, petroleum.

There are in the several states some elements of what once might have been sovereignty, but so many elements are wanting that we correctly speak of it as local self government plus a territorial means of expressing the will of a people in the control of the larger and real sovereignty.

The purpose here is not academ-

ic discussion of this abstract constitutional question but to glance at the history of this old national chestnut and its effect in our national life.

Within three years after the inauguration of President Washington, Governor Telfair of Georgia challenged the right of the Federal government to make a treaty with the Cherokee Indians without the presence and sanction of a representative of the state of Georgia. To show his contempt for the Federal government and assert the rights of the state of Georgia, he in 1793 marched the state militia against an unoffending village of the Cherokees, where the inhabitants were living in fancied security, under their treaty with the Federal government, killed a number of the men and captured as slaves a considerable number of women and children. The firmness of President Washington put a stop to this assertion of sovereignty, but the claim was never surrendered until after the civil war.

The Whiskey insurrection, incipient in North Carolina and overt in the South West countries of Pennsylvania in 1794 was the next attempt to assert the sovereignty of the people of a state against the Federal government. This was over the right to levy internal revenue. Washington's 15,000 soldiers soon put an end to that.

A more widespread movement to defy the Federal authorities was the revolt against the judicial authority. Article III and Sec. 2 of the Constitution very definitely extends the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to cover cases "between a state and citizens of another state and subjects of foreign states." After this provision has been upheld by the Supreme Court a process was begun in Massachusetts in 1796. John Hancock who was then governor called the legislature in special session and they passed a resolution instructing the governor and the courts to ignore the service of the United States Marshal.

About the same time such a process was begun in Georgia. The legislature of that state passed a bill inflicting the death penalty, without benefit of clergy, upon any United States Marshal who should dare attempt to serve any warrant upon any state officer.

This agitation in most of the

states led to the adoption in 1798 of the Eleventh Amendment. The aftermath of this surrender to the state's rights party was not only to give great prestige to the state sovereignty idea but it led to the repudiation of state bonds on a considerable scale. This is an incident in our national history which no true American can contemplate with any satisfaction. An incident that we shall probably hear from before the international debts are all paid as our chief debtor holds most of these repudiated obligations.

In 1798 the legislature of Kentucky passed a resolution asserting her right to interpret the Constitution of the United States in all matters where it touched her affairs. In 1799 the legislature of Virginia passed such a resolution and again in 1828 another declaring her right to nullify any act of Congress.

In 1832 South Carolina convened a constitutional convention and declared her right and intent to nullify the tariff laws of the nation. The legislature convening immediately afterwards took steps to maintain this position by force of arms. President Jackson's proclamation, written by his Secretary of the Treasury, Louis McLane, asserted in clear and unmistakable though ironic terms the sovereignty of the United States. It is quite probable that his emphatic declaration of intention, privately given, to hang the first man who resisted the collector had far more effect to stop the debate for a little while.

Involved with the question of slavery this constitutional question constituted the "irrepressible conflict" of that time, which was never settled until the readmission of the seceding states. To get back into the Union the claim of sovereignty had to be surrendered. But the blood and suffering of the Civil War and the Reconstruction period were just a part of the injury that came from following this ignus fatus into the swamps of war.

Most Americans accepted from that time this distinction between local self government and sovereignty until the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment. Of course politicians have always mouthed the high sounding phrases of "State Sovereignty" and "Our sovereign state" as vote catchers but until

(Continued on page 7, col. 1)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN*Founded in 1867*

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

*Official Organ of***THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N***An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863*

Published Monthly, except August, at the Association's Headquarters,

209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, \$1.00 the year, payable in advance.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa., under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Beer Issue

The February "Beer Issue" of The Christian Statesman has met with a most favorable reception. At this writing, February 23rd, five extra editions totaling 30,000 copies have been published, all of which except 3,000 copies have been distributed on orders from Bible classes and other groups. Copies can still be secured in quantities of 100 or more at the rate of \$1.50 per hundred, postpaid. Order a supply for your church, Sabbath school, Bible class or for house to house distribution. Please send check with your order.

Inhuman and Immoral

Compelling twenty-three percent of the wage earners to work on Sunday while thousands of wage earners are vainly asking for jobs, is the charge which the Michigan Lord's Day Leader brings against the Michigan Automobile manufacturers and other corporations such as the Michigan Refrigerator Company and the Anacanda Wire Works.

Accepting this as correct and we have no reason to doubt it, such a course reveals certain underlying ideas that are obsessing the management of too many great industrial organizations. They are:

1. That the only way to adapt industry to the fluctuating demands of the markets is to have a considerable surplus of labor that can be hired and fired in response to these fluctuations.
2. That the management of an industry has no responsibility beyond maintaining sanitary conditions, safety devices and paying wages for the time while the men are at work.
3. That no need of the workers must be allowed to interfere with the most economical running of the industry. Or to put the matter in another way, three hundred percent dividends, hundred thousand dollar

salaries and million dollar bonuses must have prior consideration over the needs of the wage earners.

Every one of these economic fallacies and absurdities lie at the basis of the unemployment problem here introduced as well as of all unemployment. They must be abandoned by industry if it is to continue on a free and independent basis. It is man's inhumanity to man that is to blame for most of our social and economic ills and a decent morality as well as economic stability and social progress demand the elimination of these inhuman and immoral concepts of control in industry.

The citizens of Michigan have in their power to effect a 23% cure of present unemployment by passing and enforcing such a Sunday rest law as that in force in Canada.

That Hawaiian Situation

In order to understand the conditions out of which the horrible scandal of recent months has grown we must take into account that the habit of picking and choosing, common to all of our cities, as to the laws they will or will not enforce, has grown up there as well as here. Then the prostitution of legal ethics to the fee in criminal cases has made the same sort of a cockpit of the courts there as in the states where the defense attorney considers it consistent with his barrister's oath to defeat justice if he can. But here is the peculiar elements in the problem.

These islands with their strangely mixed population have been imbibing for some years in over doses, a mixture of nordicitis, Hollywood sex sentiment and militarism. While Uncle Sam has furnished this deadly potion he has utterly failed to protect the native women against the 5,000 to 15,000 enlisted men of the army, navy and marines quartered there in barracks. These men are neither better nor worse than average young men of the United States but they are kept outside of normal human relations.

Is it a wonder that occasionally a native or a Japanese or a Chinese citizen born under the U. S. flag, should raise the question of how much better is the wife of an American naval officer than the wife of a Japanese merchant or the daughter of an Hawaiian planter?

No one in their senses would say anything to condone rape. But both Federal and Territorial authorities seem to have ignored the sexual irregularities of the rank and file; their illegitimate offspring and their wife abandonment when their term of service expired.

To some of these men, the women of the darker skinned races are just niggers. There seems to have been little more chivalry in their treatment of these women than of the slave women before the civil war. All this has been ignored.

The military policy which keeps there numbers of soldiers, sailors and marines altogether out of proportion to the population of the islands must bear a considerable portion of the blame for these conditions. It is the old problem of the barracks and the surrounding homes.

If both territorial and Federal officials will impartially and efficiently enforce the laws against these lesser sexual irregularities, this scandal and incipient race war can be ended. Otherwise we predict it will grow worse. But chiefly this is one of the inevitable by-products of militarism.

An Open Letter to Also-Ran Cox

My Dear Sir:

I noticed in one of the Washington Dailies recently that at the Party Dinner in Washington on January 7, you gave to the assembled politicians the following bit of advice. "May we not now respectfully ask that you call the political ecclesiastics back to their pulpits that truth may go to their people."

I presume that the truth you want to have "go to the people" is the wet propaganda of Mr. Raskob, Mr. Curran, Mrs. Sabin and her Crusader son. And by political ecclesiastics you mean some of the leaders of the Anti-Saloon League and the church temperance societies. Probably you intend to include us all who aim to keep our people well posted on this issue.

Thanks for the compliment, Mr. Cox. We have not had such assurance of our power from a wet speaker for a blue moon. But really are you not asking over much of these politicians? We only ask them to tell the truth and do right. You are asking them to compel the clergy to lie down and keep still, to stultify their intellects and corrupt their consciences and leave their flocks to the tender mercies of the wolves in sheep's clothing.

They simply cannot do it, Mr. Cox. Not until water runs up hill and these apostles of appetite and exploitation open their meetings with prayer and close them with "Stand up, Stand up for Jesus;" not until liquor is scientifically proven to be a good and safe food and economic waste is proven to

be national thrift and the saloon keeper is proven by experience to be a man who loves God supremely and his neighbor as himself, can these wet, slippery, sniveling, self seeking political copperheads make the preachers shut up on this prohibition question.

Have mercy on them, Mr. Cox; Don't demand the impossible.

Just one of a hundred thousand.

Facts About French Liquor

It is often reported by returning tourists of wet proclivities that France is becoming a nation of beer drinkers. If this is so, this habit is not supplanting wine drinking to any appreciable extent, if recent statistics are to be trusted.

An editorial writer in the New York times recently stated that the wine production of France and Algeria in 1931 was eight billion quarts and that most of Algeria's production goes to France. The World Almanac gives France's Local Production as 177 million gallons. This writer adds, "Since most of Algeria's wine goes to France it would mean that her 41,000,000 people will have to get along with nearly 200 quarts of wine per year per head."

This is rather a rough calculation but it gets close to the per capita consumption. Algeria probably consumes one-sixth of this at home. The exports of wine from France will amount to about one-sixth of her production. This would roughly account for about three-twelfths of this vast amount of nearly 2,000,000,000 gallons.

Another factor must also be taken into account and that is, by no means all of the 41,000,000 of France drink intoxicants. There is a growing number of men like Foch and Clemanceau who are abstainers. Then there are at least one-fifth of the population too young to be counted among these stout trenchermen. So we shall have to deduct about 25 per cent from the figures of population and about 25 per cent from this total production. This would give us roughly 48 gallons per capita for the drinkers.

Estimating the alcoholic content of this wine as averaging 14 per cent would give us a per capita consumption of absolute alcohol of approximately 6.72 gallons. Reduced to a daily consumption this would be 6/10 of a gill, or 1.15 ounces, of absolute alcohol. This would be equal to about two glasses of

whiskey and about the same as two and a fourth glasses of pre-prohibition beer, enough to keep her drinking population perpetually under the influence of alcohol. To this must be added the growing consumption of beer, a considerable quantity of whiskey and her traditional absinthe.

France may carry this handicap for the present, but this economic waste and physical dissipation will eventually relegate her to an inferior place among the nations. In any event the knowledge of this fact will go a long way toward drying up any sympathy she may expect from this country in her economic troubles. She might economize by switching some of her acreage of vines to bread stuffs or meat or wool growing.

The serious thing about this whole matter is that it is this vast industry of not only France but of Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece and Jugo-Slavia that is united in its determination to break down prohibition in the world wherever it exists. The worst feature of it is that they have a treaty on file at Geneva that puts the governments back of this war against prohibition.

The Cigarette Spirit

Apparently unable to learn from the downfall of other exploiters of human weakness the cigarette manufacturers are blindly following the same course of greed that brought destruction to the lotteries and the liquor traffic. Their mendacious advertisements, in the newspapers and on the bill boards, their callous disregard of the finer things of Christian culture, and their determination to make nicotine slaves of American youth, are sooner or later bound to bring the same reaction in public sentiment as that which has overtaken the moving picture interests in the last two years if not the same as fell upon the liquor interest twelve years ago. But they seem to be as blind to this as they are to truth or the demands of a growing Christian culture.

The most recent display of this spirit was a broadside delivered over the radio by one of the officials of a well known tobacco company. It was fired at Governor Pinchot because of his proposal to place a temporary tax of two cents upon each package of cigarettes as a part of the program to raise \$20,000,000 to relieve unemployment by hastening projected public works.

One unacquainted with the facts would have thought that the Governor proposed to squeeze this whole sum

out of the poor victims of the nicotine habit instead of about one twentieth of it. This tax was in reality but a small item in a great program.

This propagandist of the tobacco companies gravely told us that cigarettes were not a luxury but a necessity; that this tax was oppressive and unfair; that it could not be collected from the wholesaler and would subject the retailer to much unnecessary work and to the temptation of bootlegging cigarettes, and it would cultivate snoopers and promote lawlessness.

More fallacies and selfishness, more specious, special pleading and insults to the intelligence of the thinking public were contained in this ten minute talk than has been seen or heard in anything since Adolphus Busch gave his notorious "beer letter" to the press.

But the worst feature of it all was the evident selfishness that grinned through the lines. If every cigarette user in the state, and there are more than a million of them, had contributed in this manner \$2 by using 100 packages during the next year, would that class have suffered one particle of inconvenience, or one moment's conscious deprivation by this contribution of \$2,000,000 to give employment to the six or seven hundred thousand unemployed in the state? Yet the needs of the unemployed seemed as nothing compared with the tremendous importance of saving the cigarette smokers this additional 2 cents per package on their indulgence.

What was pinching this tobacco official was not the woes of the over taxed smokers but the probability that the company would have to contribute some portion of this sum out of its surplus and dividends. His spirit was akin to that of the Dupont who in different circumstances plead for laying such a tax on the people in order to lessen his corporation taxes. Could this man have seen a chance to pass on some of their own income or corporation taxes by such a tax he would have been for it as keenly as he was against it.

There is not an argument against either the restriction, taxation or prohibition of either intoxicating liquor or tobacco but has its roots in pure unadulterated selfishness.

Senator Brookhart of Iowa said before this committee of the House "the shameless publicity given to the wet side recently by the press associations and withholding of news on the other side has developed into a real racket and unless this is dropped it will necessitate a congressional investigation."

Association Activities

Four hundred thousand or more pages of prohibition literature were distributed by The National Reform Association in the month of February.

The February, "Beer Issue," of The Christian Statesman has been highly commended for its up to date information on the live and important issue of whether we shall legalize beer. The forms of this issue were held by the printer and we offered to supply copies in quantities for distribution in Bible Classes and other groups at the rate of \$1.50 per 100 copies, post-paid. To date orders have been received and filled for over 20,000 copies. We have also supplied the County Sabbath School Association of Mercer County, Pennsylvania, with 10,000 copies of a special edition of the "Beer Issue" for distribution in the 121 Bible Schools of that county, on February 28.

Arrangements are being made to furnish Sabbath School, or other county organizations, in other counties with a supply for county-wide distribution. Should our readers wish to undertake a similar distribution of this "Beer Issue" in their county or community, write us for particulars.

In Beaver County, Pennsylvania, the Association is furnishing over 200,000 pages of prohibition literature in leaflet form, for house to house distribution. We are planning to increase this distribution in the hope of reaching our goal of 1,000,000 pages of prohibition literature distributed each month, from now until the November election.

Mrs. Shepard's Letter

The Mormon authorities are constantly reiterating to their followers that the knowledge of the Elders in their missionary work throughout the country is often a source of surprise and chagrin to ministers and members of other churches. In church meetings and through the printed page they tell how "the comparatively inexperienced missionaries are able to define clearly and correctly (?) points of Christian doctrine that learned divines will hesitate over, through a lack of true knowledge."

In their gigantic bigotry they believe that the humblest "Latter Day Saint" who has obeyed the true gospel (?) as revealed through

Joseph Smith and who has thereby received the gift of the Holy Ghost, can always confound the ministers of other denominations. The Mormon Church claims to have a literature that is rich in the true knowledge of Christian doctrine; they claim an authorized ministry under divine tutorship of the Holy Ghost; they claim they have given to the world a wealth of religious knowledge since the restoration of the true gospel one hundred years ago through the ministry of Joseph Smith, their Prophet; they claim that by having added to the Bible three additional volumes of Scripture brought forth by heavenly inspiration in those latter days—The Book of Mormon, The Doctrine and Covenants and The Pearl of Great Price—they have a superiority over all other churches in their knowledge of God and heavenly things.

These bigots thus reason that their restored church, like the primitive church, "has access to infinite knowledge through an inspired priesthood and that they cannot fail to surpass in the knowledge of religious truth other churches whose main reliance is upon the learning of the world."

One of the Mormon leaders said, "It is not to be wondered at that the popular preachers of the day whose chief aim is to please and satisfy those who employ them, are so seriously lacking in true religious knowledge." This church would like to have the ministers of our churches receive and obey the true gospel of Jesus Christ as it has been restored to the earth in these latter days through the instrumentality of Joseph Smith. We judge that if the orthodox ministers would be born of water and of the Spirit in God's appointed way under the hands of the authorized servants of the Mormon Church they would immediately receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is the true guide to heavenly knowledge and would become informed just as their young missionaries are, whom they are today unable to meet in religious argument. What extreme bigotry!

Against all of this bigotry there lies on my desk a new pamphlet called "The Church Out of Order" which has just been published in Salt Lake and it is written by a young man, formerly a member who was a convert in Ohio, and who has had his eyes opened since

moving to the "City of Zion." He deals with polygamy without gloves and it is a very startling revelation, his keen gift in portraying the progress of this peculiar doctrine. He tells in a trite way of its origin at Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1843. It was known as the law of God and the only means by which man can be exalted to become a god. This doctrine was known by Joseph Smith as early as 1831, but was not given out by the prophet until 1843. The author follows this teaching throughout the years down to the present time showing it in all of its hideous and disagreeable advances and relating many incidents connecting the Mormons of today in this diabolical practice. It would be difficult for me to review it fully.

The Reginal Conference of the W.C.T.U. was held in Los Angeles in February. A very large attendance greeted the speakers for two days. Two speakers were sent by the national and many local speakers took part in the forms and discussions. I was invited to give the chief address on the first day and I dealt with "Dry Planks and Dry Presidents." I dared to prophecy that neither major party would place a wet plank in their party platform and also said that Congress would vote down, if brought to a vote, all amendments or repeals of the Eighteenth Amendment. Mayor Porter of Los Angeles was one of the favorite speakers for he was the one mayor that dared to refuse wine when he was in France with twenty other U. S. mayors. He stands very high with the Christian people of this city. Another speaker was Lieutenant Gov. Merriman a fine Christian gentleman who discussed Law Enforcement. We were all heartened at the Loyalty Luncheon given by the Board of Strategy Committee on the second day of the Conference when Dr. Dexter, President of Whittier College gave a masterful and helpful address.

I am so happy that the President of our own Association is Treasurer of the Board of Strategy made up of all our temperance organizations. We should gladly uphold him in a financial as well as in a prayerful way as he carries on his great efforts in collecting the dimes to carry on the 1932 campaign. Mrs. N. O. Pritchard is leading in this great work in the Pittsburgh area and every one who believes in our great cause should come to the assistance of the Board at this critical time.

The Ignus Fatus of State Sovereignty

(Continued from page 3)

1919 it seemed that as a constitutional question the debate had been settled. Since then it has been revived again by the protagonists of John Barleycorn in a movement to get rid of the Amendment. This movement is now in full swing and gaining considerable momentum each month. The one success in getting rid of an unpopular provision in 1798 encourages some to believe that it can be repeated if the popular clamor can be worked to a sufficient volume and intensity.

Four lines of attack are being tried out. The first is a direct movement for outright repeal of the amendment. This is not making much headway because of the evident impossibility of its succeeding in this generation at least.

The second is based upon this syllogism, The states all have provisions in their own constitutions forbidding the passage of any law confiscating property without due process of law. The Eighteenth Amendment does so confiscate property. Therefore the legislatures had no right to ratify the amendment. The amendment was never legally ratified and all that Congress needs to do is to declare that fact. The precedent cited is the action of the British Parliament in getting rid of the Commonwealth set up by Cromwell.

Two difficulties bar this line of attack. The first is a long line of judicial decisions that a prohibition law does not confiscate property in any legal sense of that term, and the second is the fact pointed out in *Hawk vs. Smith*, U. S. Supreme Court, that the legislatures of the states do not derive their power to ratify amendments from the people of their own states but from the Constitution itself.

The third line of attack is the Roosevelt, Raskob, Bingham Home Rule Amendment now before Congress which provides that any state may vote itself out of the Union so far as the Eighteenth Amendment is concerned. Several objections present themselves against this scheme. The first is that it would resurrect this old question of state sovereignty and embody it in principle in the Constitution. The nation has suffered enough from that already. Thoughtful people are asking how such states propose to confine the liquor traffic which they would relegalize, within the bounds of their own territory. Every one

knows that they could not and would not if they could. Such purported solution of the problem of liquor would be confusion worse confounded. Then it is equally evident that it would be just as difficult if not more so to get such an amendment through the states as an outright repealer.

The last and most promising line of attack from the wet point of view is that of passive nullification. This is the scheme of Alfred E. Smith, the LaFolletts and Senator Bingham. They propose to attack the state laws passed to support the amendment under the "Concurrent" clause of the amendment, and by intensive campaigns in the states one at a time repeal these laws. They have six states now so lined up against the government and they boast of prospects of adding six more to this slacker column during the elections of this year. Then they propose to make a great outcry against the tyranny of Federal policing and make a concerted drive to beat down the federal appropriation for enforcement and leave the amendment in the same position as the Fourteenth and Fifteenth are today.

This course will be more apt to result finally in strengthening the Federal government than that of the states. The average citizen simply will not become terrified at the possibility of having to trust more to the protection of Uncle Sam. He rather prefers that to the city ridden, state police protection he is getting now. Then these men forget that the Federal government can police the states if it has to do so and it can do so without a separate enforcement bureau if necessary. There are many who viewing the growing complexity of our expanding country realize the necessity for increasing the power of the central government in order to maintain the public welfare. Such would welcome this opportunity to add to the powers of the Federal government. If the states begin to pick and choose as to what provisions of the Constitution they will and will not support they may be sure that the people will enlarge the powers of the Federal government to enable it to compel obedience. Few feel any allegiance to the state but most would die for the Country.

Then it is so very evident to all except those who do not want to see, that the conditions as to liquor are so much better, even in the slacker states, than they were under the saloon regime or are

under the Canadian plan that more and more the people will look to the federal authorities to protect their homes against the moonshiner, the bootlegger and the drunken driver. That "concurrent" provision was placed in the amendment to conserve state rights. If the states repudiate the obligations which those rights entail they may be sure that the people will not live unprotected. The average citizen who is dry by conviction is apt to say to the wets "I line up behind Uncle Sam. Nothing he will ever do to me would equal the ruin and misery that lies in the path of state sovereignty and the nullification of the Constitution in order to attain that baneful end."

Garner's Prohibition Record

In view of the fact that Hon. John N. Garner, Speaker of the House of Representatives, is coming into favor as the nominee of the Democratic Party for President, his prohibition record is a matter of interest. This record as given out by Dr. Edwin C. Dinwiddie, Executive Secretary of the National Prohibition Board of Strategy, is as follows:

"Speaker John N. Garner formerly opposed prohibition legislation but in later years has supported some of the enforcement measures. In 1913 he voted for the Webb-Kenyon Interstate Liquor Shipment Bill and for its passage over the veto. In the same year he voted with the Wets in favor of the Burleson Amendment to the Jones-Works District of Columbia Code. In 1914 he voted against the Hobson National Prohibition Resolution. In 1917 he voted for the rule to consider Alaska prohibition; he also voted for the Anti-advertising and Bone Dry Mails Bill; in the same year he also voted against the District of Columbia Prohibition Bill and against the National Prohibition Resolution. In 1918 he voted against war prohibition in the Food Bill. In 1919 he voted for the Igoe wet substitute for the Volstead Act but upon its defeat he voted for the Enforcement Code and in 1921 he voted for the supplemental Anti-Beer Bill. He voted favorably on the legislation touching the Coast Guard in 1924 and in 1928 he voted against the wet proposal to limit prohibition enforcement concerning denaturants in alcohol. In 1929 he voted for the Jones Bill for increased penalties."

The Lesson from Finland

Rev. H. B. Mansell

A WISE man learns by the mistakes of others; a prudent people is counselled by the errors of other nations.

Doubtless our anti-prohibition friends consider that Finland's experiment with prohibition should be studied by America. And so it may, with great profit.

The experiment in Finland had certain inherent errors from the start. First it permitted the legal manufacture and sale of two per cent beer. That mild drink was to prevent excess; it was only a teaser, a little thin blood to whet the appetite of a tiger.

Second it allowed the legal sale of alcohol and alcoholic beverages for medical purposes with very few safeguards against abuse. The result was what might be expected, an enormous sale for alleged medical use. Even veterinaries could prescribe and Prof. Wuorinen in his book, "Prohibition in Finland" calls attention to the fact that horses in Finland developed peculiar diseases that could only be treated with expensive imported liquors. More serious was the fact that the sale of portable spirits by the government sales stores through drug stores and apothecaries became so large that the per capita consumption of alcohol rose to a third of what it was before the world war.

To these inherent defects were added the evils of illicit manufacture and smuggling to which Finland was especially exposed by its geographical position and extensive coast with many inlets from the Baltic.

All these worked to produce a situation which was far short of effective prohibition. We have safeguarded our experiment from both of the first two evils. The illegal sale of medical alcohol in this land is not a serious factor as much of it is purchased by old addicts who are passing out of the problem by death. But the warning to America is clear; no beer and strict regulation of all sources of medical supplies is essential to real prohibition.

It is worth noting that even with such handicaps prohibition in Finland held its own until a combination of adverse forces could be arrayed against it. It was repudiated only when the government had become practically bankrupt. Finnish 6½% bonds were below forty cents

on the dollar in New York last December. The government could not balance its budget. By methods that would have been denounced as outrageous in this land the government accumulated thousands of dollars worth of seized liquors. What came close to a battle was fought in Finnish waters with smugglers just before the vote and the government practically adopted hi-jacking. The value of these seized liquors was expected to go a long way toward balancing the budget of that little land.

It is well known that European liquor interests brought heavy pressure to bear upon Iceland and Norway to secure the removal of adverse legislation. The same interests have boasted that they had entered into the fight against prohibition in Canada. Is it reasonable to assume that they took no part in the matter in Finland? Or is it more reasonable to assume that they brought pressure to bear?

The government in power in Finland was unfriendly to prohibition. It wished to utilize the liquors it had seized. It may have been promised a loan by French wine growers as has been openly asserted. It certainly sprang the election upon the people choosing mid-winter when the rural dry vote could be held to a minimum.

Another lesson to America; do not put the enforcement of prohibition in the hands of an unfriendly president or minor officials. Only those who believe in the purpose of the law can be safely trusted to carry it into effect.

Let us also note that even with all this pressure only a third of the voters of Finland rejected prohibition. The others either did not vote or were in favor of it. Many of those who did not vote doubtless preferred prohibition if it were strictly enforced. The ballot gave them no choice between an imperfect form of prohibition poorly enforced and the return of liquor. They had no chance to vote for a strict enforcement of the law. It is also noticeable that in all their pleas for a referendum in this country the wets very carefully avoid the suggestion that the people be allowed to vote for a stricter enforcement of the law. Some time back when the Literary Digest carried on its poll, to which the wets continually refer, it was noticed

that only about one-fifth of its ballots were returned and counted. At that time another magazine, the Pathfinder, conducted a prohibition poll. A farmer friend of mine received ballots in both. He said he threw the Digest ballot into the waste paper basket but voted the other which included what he wanted, "Stricter enforcement." I called his attention to the fact that he had paid the postage on the one he voted while the Digest paid the postage on the other. I am confident that there are millions in this land who want a "Stricter enforcement," sending the Al Capones to their proper habitations. It is instructive to remember that if the votes for stricter enforcement are excluded from the Pathfinder Poll the proportions for the three questions submitted by the Digest are nearly the same for both polls. But in the whole Pathfinder Poll nearly one-half of all the votes were for "Stricter Enforcement."

If the Constitution provided any way in which the opinion of the American people could be asked they should certainly be allowed to have a more strict enforcement of our present prohibition law as one of the options. The only form of referendum we have, the votes of our legislators certainly show a demand for stricter enforcement. If there is any doubt consult any test votes in Congress during the past twelve years.

Clinton Howard, in opening a campaign to bring Massachusetts back into the Union, said, "The saloon is not dead but simply lying low and awaiting some yellow dog president who would unbar the door to its legal return." Right as he usually is.

Dr. Wm. Gerry Morgan, President of the American Medical Association, said before this Beer Committee that "four per cent beer is not intoxicating and would have a favorable effect on the youth of the nation." Shades of Von Liebig! How are the mighty fallen? Not intoxicating to take half an ounce of absolute alcohol into the system every time a man takes a drink? It might not make him stagger but it might easily lead to a smash up on the road. Verily the hayseed is not all in the hair of the farmer.